



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,489	04/06/2001	Jarmo Makela	297-006914-US (C01)	5743
2512	7590	10/15/2009		
Perman & Green, LLP 99 Hawley Lane Stratford, CT 06614			EXAMINER ELAHEE, MD S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/15/2009 PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/827,489

**Applicant(s)**

MAKELA ET AL.

**Examiner**

MD S. ELAHEE

**Art Unit**

2614

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-26, 33, 34, 41 and 42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-26, 33, 34, 41 and 42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/06)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This action is responsive to an amendment filed on 07/30/2009. Claims 1-3, 5-26, 33, 34, 41 and 42 are pending. Claims 4, 27-32 and 35-40 have been cancelled.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 07/30/2009 Remarks have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection which is deemed appropriate to address all of the needs at this time.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

3. Claims 10-11, 18-19, 21-22, 41 and 42 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable after overcoming rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1,3,5,7-9, 12-13, 20, 23-26 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Kang** (US 5,058,150) further in view of **Bremer** (US 6,018,671).

As to Claims 1,20,23-25 and 33, with respect to Figures 1-2 and 5, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method comprising:

in response to an incoming call to a portable terminal, identifying by said portable terminal a caller on the basis of caller ID [i.e., an identification information] (Figure 1, label 50, Figure 2, label 114 and Figure 5, label 516; Col. 11, lines 8-15) and

**Mizikovsky** further teaches selecting an accessory device (i.e., telephone answering machine (hereinafter TAD)) and the device answers or service the call uniquely (such as TAD generates outgoing message (i.e., OGM) or fax machine generates CNG tone (i.e., calling tone) when making a call and sends CED tone when responding an incoming fax call) (Col. 6, lines 51-67, Col. 7, lines 27-30). Thus, the selected device answers the call reads on claimed "reply". Also, each selected device must treat/service the call uniquely therefore, each device can produce a specific form of communication to the incoming call such as TAD generates OGM or fax machine generates CNG tone when making a call and sends CED tone when responding an incoming fax call (Col. 12, lines 25-37).

**Mizikovsky** does not explicitly teach that the portable device sends the reply and provides a selected response to the caller **only through an action of the portable terminal**.

In other words, **Mizikovsky** does not explicitly teach that a selected accessory device (i.e., TAD) responses are only sent through the mobile terminal. Also, **Mizikovsky** does not explicitly teach that the selected device (i.e., TAD) is integrated into the mobile device.

**Kang** teaches that voice analyzing/synthesizing circuit (Fig.2,3, item 221) which is actually telephone answering machine, has been included and integrated into a radio telephone (Fig.2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the TAD of **Mizikovsky** into the mobile station of **Mizikovsky** so that a

user is not required to have any external connection to connect to the external TAD to get the benefit of carrying both of the TAD along with the mobile station easily as one unit.

**Mizikovsky** in view of **Kang** does not teach, “a reply is accomplished by said portable terminal according to a selection made by the user, said selection comprising a command received from the user after alerting the user of said incoming call”. **Bremer** teaches that a reply is accomplished by said portable terminal according to a selection made by the user, said selection comprising a command received from the user after alerting the user of said incoming call (Figure 4; Col. 3, line 61-Col. 4, line 10). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add selected message capability to **Mizikovsky**’s invention in view of **Kang**’s invention for providing callers with selected messages as taught by **Bremer**’s invention in order not to keep a caller waiting.

As to Claim 3, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with Claim 1, wherein in response to an incoming call,

**Mizikovsky** teaches providing users with alert signals and, therefore, waits for a user response (Figure 5, label 510). However, **Mizikovsky** in view of **Kang** does not teach, “the portable terminal alarms and waits during a certain delay, and if a user during said delay does not answer said call, the portable terminal sends said reply”. **Bremer** teaches the limitation (Figure 4, labels 4 16,420). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add default capability to **Mizikovsky**’s invention in view of **Kang**’s invention for providing callers with default messages as taught by **Bremer**’s invention in order not to keep a caller waiting.

As to Claim 5, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 3, wherein the portable terminal gives a mute soundless alarm (Col. 6, lines 43-50).

As to Claim 7, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 1, wherein said reply is at least partly formulated based on the identification of the calling party (Figure 5, label 506).

As to Claim 8, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 7 wherein a reply is sent to certain identified calling parties only (Figure 5, labels 508,512).

As to Claim 9, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 7, wherein the reply to be sent in response to the incoming call is different according to the respective company said call is coming from (Figure 5, labels 508,512,516).

As to Claims 12-13, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 7, wherein said identification of the calling party is based on registered caller IDs (a telephone notebook) comprised by the portable terminal (Figure 2, label 106).

As to Claim 26, **Mizikovsky** teaches a portable terminal in accordance with claim 25, wherein said step of taking response action comprises sending a reply to the caller, said reply being a voice message (one of the following: a voice message, e-mail message, facsimile, and an SMS message in the form of a character string) (Col. 8, lines 51-59).

8. Claims 2, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Kang** further in view of **Bremer** further in view of **Jambhekar** et al. (US 5,848,356).

As to Claims 2,6, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with Claim 1, wherein said plurality of forms of communication include a voice message.

**Mizikovsky** further teaches a facsimile peripheral which suggests a facsimile accessory and facsimile message; a multimedia terminal which suggests an e-mail accessory and response; EIA/TIA 15-54 alert messages which suggests a SMS accessory and response.

However, **Mizikovsky** in view of **Kang** further in view of **Bremer** does not teach, “an e-mail message, a facsimile message, and an SMS message in the form of a character string”. **Jambhekar** teaches e-mail, facsimile and SMS messages (Figures 5P and 8A). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add e-mail, facsimile and SMS capabilities to **Mizikovsky**’s invention in view of **Kang**’s invention further in view of **Bremer**’s invention for providing callers with response messages as taught by **Jambhekar**’s invention in order not to distract a user by sending pre-programmed responses.

9. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Kang** further in view of **Bremer** further in view of **Villa-Real** (US 4,481,382).



As to Claim 14, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 7.

**Mizikovsky** teaches providing selected accessory responses to callers (Figure 5, label 518). However, **Mizikovsky** in view of **Kang** further in view of **Bremer** does not teach, “wherein a reminder to call the identified calling party will be stored into the portable terminal, in order to be presented to a user later”. Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add reminder capability to **Mizikovsky**’s invention in view of **Kang**’s invention further in view of **Bremer**’s invention for alerting users as taught by **Villa-Real**’s invention in order to provide reminders to users when calls become due.

10. Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Kang** further in view of **Bremer** further in view of **Wolff** et al. (US 5,327,486).

As to Claims 15-17, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance claim 1, wherein said reply includes:

**Mizikovsky** teaches providing callers with selected user accessory responses (Figure 5, label 518). However, **Mizikovsky** in view of **Kang** further in view of **Bremer** does not teach, “time information”. **Wolff** teaches the limitation (Figures 8-9). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add time capability to **Mizikovsky**’s invention in view of **Kang**’s invention further in view of **Bremer**’s

invention for providing callers with selected time-based messages as taught by **Wolff**'s invention in order not to keep a caller waiting.

11. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 12-13, 20, 23-26 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Bremer** (US 6,018,671).

As to Claims 1,20,23-25 and 33, with respect to Figures 1-2 and 5, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method comprising:

in response to an incoming call to a portable terminal, identifying by said portable terminal a caller on the basis of caller ID [i.e., an identification information] (Figure 1, label 50, Figure 2, label 114 and Figure 5, label 516; Col. 11, lines 8-15) and

**Mizikovsky** further teaches selecting an accessory device (i.e., telephone answering machine (hereinafter TAD)) and the device answers or service the call uniquely (such as TAD generates outgoing message (i.e., OGM) or fax machine generates CNG tone (i.e., calling tone) when making a call and sends CED tone when responding an incoming fax call) (Col. 6, lines 51-67, Col. 7, lines 27-30). Thus, the selected device answers the call reads on claimed "reply". Also, each selected device must treat/service the call uniquely therefore, each device can produce a specific form of communication to the incoming call such as TAD generates OGM or fax machine generates CNG tone when making a call and sends CED tone when responding an incoming fax call (Col. 12, lines 25-37).

**Mizikovsky** does not explicitly teach that the portable device sends the reply and provides a selected response to the caller **only through an action of the portable terminal**.

In other words, **Mizikovsky** does not explicitly teach that a selected accessory device (i.e., TAD) responses are only sent through the mobile terminal. Also, **Mizikovsky** does not explicitly teach that the selected device (i.e., TAD) is integrated into the mobile device.

**Mizikovsky** suggests that accessories are peripherals which have been included into the mobile station and which function together to process incoming calls (Col. 3, lines 1-4 and Col.7, lines 5-7). Further, according to **In re Larson** 144 U.S.P.Q. 347, when parts are rigidly secured together as a single unit, they function as a unitary whole. Further it would be obvious to integrate the peripherals 52 as Accessories into the mobile device so that users are not required to be present at the mobile station for responding to incoming calls.

Therefore, having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious if it is not inherent to one of ordinary skill in the art that the accessories 50 together with the other elements of the mobile station constitute a unitary mobile station and accessory responses from the mobile station are sent only through the mobile station.

**Mizikovsky** further does not teach, “a reply is accomplished by said portable terminal according to a selection made by the user, said selection comprising a command received from the user after alerting the user of said incoming call”. **Bremer** teaches that a reply is accomplished by said portable terminal according to a selection made by the user, said selection comprising a command received from the user after alerting the user of said incoming call (Figure 4; Col. 3, line 61-Col. 4, line 10). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add selected message capability to **Mizikovsky**’s invention for providing callers with selected messages as taught by **Bremer**’s invention in order not to keep a caller waiting.

As to Claim 3, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with Claim 1, wherein in response to an incoming call,

**Mizikovsky** teaches providing users with alert signals and, therefore, waits for a user response (Figure 5, label 510). However, **Mizikovsky** does not teach, “the portable terminal alarms and waits during a certain delay, and if a user during said delay does not answer said call, the portable terminal sends said reply”. **Bremer** teaches the limitation (Figure 4, labels 416,420). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add default capability to **Mizikovsky**'s invention for providing callers with default messages as taught by Bremer's invention in order not to keep a caller waiting.

As to Claim 5, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 3, wherein the portable terminal gives a mute soundless alarm (Col. 6, lines 43-50).

As to Claim 7, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 1, wherein said reply is at least partly formulated based on the identification of the calling party (Figure 5, label 506).

As to Claim 8, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 7 wherein a reply is sent to certain identified calling parties only (Figure 5, labels 508,512).

As to Claim 9, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 7, wherein the reply to be sent in response to the incoming call is different according to the respective company said call is coming from (Figure 5, labels 508,512,516).

As to Claims 12-13, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 7, wherein said identification of the calling party is based on registered caller IDs (a telephone notebook) comprised by the portable terminal (Figure 2, label 106).

As to Claim 26, **Mizikovsky** teaches a portable terminal in accordance with claim 25, wherein said step of taking response action comprises sending a reply to the caller, said reply being a voice message (one of the following: a voice message, e-mail message, facsimile, and an SMS message in the form of a character string) (Col. 8, lines 51-59).

12. Claims 2, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Jambhekar** et al. (US 5,848,356) in view of **Bremer** further in view of **Jambhekar** et al. (US 5,848,356).

As to Claims 2,6, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with Claim 1, wherein said plurality of forms of communication include a voice message.

**Mizikovsky** further teaches a facsimile peripheral which suggests a facsimile accessory and facsimile message; a multimedia terminal which suggests an e-mail accessory and response; EIA/TIA 15-54 alert messages which suggests a SMS accessory and response.

However, **Mizikovsky** in view of **Bremer** does not teach, “an e-mail message, a facsimile message, and an SMS message in the form of a character string”. **Jambhekar** teaches e-mail, facsimile and SMS messages (Figures 5P and 8A). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add e-mail, facsimile and SMS capabilities to **Mizikovsky**’s invention in view of **Bremer**’s invention for providing callers with response messages as taught by **Jambhekar**’s invention in order not to distract a user by sending pre-programmed responses.

13. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Bremer** further in view of **Villa-Real** (US 4,481,382).

As to Claim 14, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 7.

**Mizikovsky** teaches providing selected accessory responses to callers (Figure 5, label 518). However, **Mizikovsky** in view of **Bremer** does not teach, “wherein a reminder to call the identified calling party will be stored into the portable terminal, in order to be presented to a user later”. Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add reminder capability to **Mizikovsky**’s invention in view of **Bremer**’s invention for alerting users as taught by **Villa-Real**’s invention in order to provide reminders to users when calls become due.

14. Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Bremer** further in view of **Wolff et al.** (US 5,327,486).

As to Claims 15-17, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance claim 1, wherein said reply includes:

**Mizikovsky** teaches providing callers with selected user accessory responses (Figure 5, label 518). However, **Mizikovsky** in view of **Bremer** does not teach, "time information". **Wolff** teaches the limitation (Figures 8-9). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add time capability to **Mizikovsky's** invention in view of **Bremer's** invention for providing callers with selected time-based messages as taught by **Wolff's** invention in order not to keep a caller waiting.

15. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 12-13, 20, 23-26 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Wang** et al. (US 5,649,289) further in view of **Bremer** (US 6,018,671).

As to Claims 1,20,23-25 and 33, with respect to Figures 1-2 and 5, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method comprising:

in response to an incoming call to a portable terminal, identifying by said portable terminal a caller on the basis of caller ID [i.e., an identification information] (Figure 1, label 50, Figure 2, label 114 and Figure 5, label 516; Col. 11, lines 8-15) and

**Mizikovsky** further teaches selecting an accessory device (i.e., telephone answering machine (hereinafter TAD)) and the device answers or service the call uniquely (such as TAD generates outgoing message (i.e., OGM) or fax machine generates CNG tone (i.e., calling tone)

when making a call and sends CED tone when responding an incoming fax call) (Col. 6, lines 51-67, Col. 7, lines 27-30). Thus, the selected device answers the call reads on claimed “reply”. Also, each selected device must treat/service the call uniquely therefore, each device can produce a specific form of communication to the incoming call such as TAD generates OGM or fax machine generates CNG tone when making a call and sends CED tone when responding an incoming fax call (Col. 12, lines 25-37).

**Mizikovsky** does not explicitly teach that the portable device sends the reply and provides a selected response to the caller **only through an action of the portable terminal**.

**Wang** teaches that this limitation (Col. 1, lines 18-34, Col. 3, lines 41-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the feature of the portable device to send the reply and provide a selected response to the caller **only through an action of the portable terminal** into the mobile station of **Mizikovsky** so that a user is not required to have any external connection to connect to the external accessory device to get the benefit of carrying both of the accessory device along with the mobile station easily as one unit.

However, **Mizikovsky** in view of **Wang** does not teach, “a reply is accomplished by said portable terminal according to a selection made by the user, said selection comprising a command received from the user after alerting the user of said incoming call”. **Bremer** teaches that a reply is accomplished by said portable terminal according to a selection made by the user, said selection comprising a command received from the user after alerting the user of said incoming call (Figure 4; Col. 3, line 61-Col. 4, line 10). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add selected



message capability to **Mizikovsky's** invention in view of **Wang's** invention for providing callers with selected messages as taught by **Bremer's** invention in order not to keep a caller waiting.

As to Claim 3, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with Claim 1, wherein in response to an incoming call,

**Mizikovsky** teaches providing users with alert signals and, therefore, waits for a user response (Figure 5, label 510). However, **Mizikovsky** in view of **Wang** does not teach, "the portable terminal alarms and waits during a certain delay, and if a user during said delay does not answer said call, the portable terminal sends said reply". **Bremer** teaches the limitation (Figure 4, labels 4 16,420). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add default capability to **Mizikovsky's** invention in view of **Wang's** invention for providing callers with default messages as taught by **Bremer's** invention in order not to keep a caller waiting.

As to Claim 5, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 3, wherein the portable terminal gives a mute soundless alarm (Col. 6, lines 43-50).

As to Claim 7, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 1, wherein said reply is at least partly formulated based on the identification of the calling party (Figure 5, label 506).

As to Claim 8, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 7 wherein a reply is sent to certain identified calling parties only (Figure 5, labels 508,512).

As to Claim 9, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 7, wherein the reply to be sent in response to the incoming call is different according to the respective company said call is coming from (Figure 5, labels 508,512,516).

As to Claims 12-13, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 7, wherein said identification of the calling party is based on registered caller IDs (a telephone notebook) comprised by the portable terminal (Figure 2, label 106).

As to Claim 26, **Mizikovsky** teaches a portable terminal in accordance with claim 25, wherein said step of taking response action comprises sending a reply to the caller, said reply being a voice message (one of the following: a voice message, e-mail message, facsimile, and an SMS message in the form of a character string) (Col. 8, lines 51-59).

16. Claims 2, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Wang** further in view of **Bremer** further in view of **Jambhekar** et al. (US 5,848,356).

As to Claims 2,6, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with Claim 1, wherein said plurality of forms of communication include a voice message.

**Mizikovsky** further teaches a facsimile peripheral which suggests a facsimile accessory and facsimile message; a multimedia terminal which suggests an e-mail accessory and response; EIA/TIA 15-54 alert messages which suggests a SMS accessory and response.

However, **Mizikovsky** in view of **Wang** further in view of **Bremer** does not teach, “an e-mail message, a facsimile message, and an SMS message in the form of a character string”. **Jambhekar** teaches e-mail, facsimile and SMS messages (Figures 5P and 8A). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add e-mail, facsimile and SMS capabilities to **Mizikovsky**’s invention in view of **Wang**’s invention further in view of **Bremer**’s invention for providing callers with response messages as taught by **Jambhekar**’s invention in order not to distract a user by sending pre-programmed responses.

17. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Wang** further in view of **Bremer** further in view of **Villa-Real** (US 4,481,382).

As to Claim 14, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance with claim 7.

**Mizikovsky** teaches providing selected accessory responses to callers (Figure 5, label 518). However, **Mizikovsky** in view of **Wang** further in view of **Bremer** does not teach, “wherein a reminder to call the identified calling party will be stored into the portable terminal, in order to be presented to a user later”. Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add reminder capability to **Mizikovsky**’s invention in view of **Wang**’s invention further in view of **Bremer**’s invention for alerting users as taught by **Villa-Real**’s invention in order to provide reminders to users when calls become due.

18. Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizikovsky** in view of **Wang** further in view of **Bremer** further in view of **Wolff** et al. (US 5,327,486).

As to Claims 15-17, **Mizikovsky** teaches a method in accordance claim 1, wherein said reply includes:

**Mizikovsky** teaches providing callers with selected user accessory responses (Figure 5, label 518). However, **Mizikovsky** in view of **Wang** further in view of **Bremer** does not teach, "time information". **Wolff** teaches the limitation (Figures 8-9). Having the cited art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add time capability to **Mizikovsky's** invention in view of **Wang's** invention further in view of **Bremer's** invention for providing callers with selected time-based messages as taught by **Wolff's** invention in order not to keep a caller waiting.

#### *Conclusion*

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MD S. ELAHEE whose telephone number is (571)272-7536. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, FAN TSANG can be reached on (571)272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/MD S ELAHEE/  
MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2614  
October 15, 2009